

lobbying bill is worth passing, as written, and its enactment should not be delayed any further. The House should vote down the various amendments and send the bill straight to the President.

We need to focus on the task that is before us. That is the task of passing lobbying disclosure reform. I have some comments on the particular amendments. The first amendment we will vote on is an amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has good intentions with his amendment, which would prohibit lobbyists from giving gifts to Members of Congress, but his amendment is unnecessary because we have already passed comprehensive gift reform in the House and in the Senate.

Furthermore, his amendment is dangerous because it contains a definition of "gift" which is different from the definition contained in the gift reform that the House passed. The only thing that will result from the adoption of the Fox amendment is confusion and trouble for Members of the House.

Furthermore, the amendment is unfair. It will create a double standard under which a lobbyist can be fined up to \$50,000 in a civil penalty for giving a gift to a Member of Congress that is prohibited, while a Member of Congress does not face a similar civil penalty. Is that fair? Should we have one standard for imposing fines on lobbyists and exempt Members of Congress from fines? I do not think that is consistent with the spirit of reform. The Fox amendment does that, and it should be rejected for that reason alone.

Another amendment that we will consider is offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER]. The amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania deals with an important issue of lobbying by executive agencies. I believe there have been some abuses there which should be corrected, but the amendment of Mr. CLINGER is poorly drafted, it has not been through the committee process, and it will create all sorts of problems.

Under the Clinger amendment, agency press officers would not be allowed to answer inquiries from the press regarding the agency's position on legislative proposals. Does that make any sense I do not think so. This proposal goes too far. Mr. CLINGER should take this back through his committee, which has jurisdiction of the issue, and come forward with a refined proposal to really address the abuse. This amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] is designed and calculated to ensure a veto of this bill.

□ 1245

The President is bound to veto this bill if anything like the Clinger amendment is attached to it. We should not derail lobbying disclosure reform by adding extraneous amendments such as this.

There are other amendments that will be considered; some of them have

some merit. Some of them, standing alone, are amendments that I would support. But this is not the time; this is not the place. We need to get on with the business that has occupied the Congress off and on for more than 40 years, and if we can pass this bill and send it to the President I believe that we will demonstrate to the American people that things really have changed here in Washington, that we can accomplish things in this Congress that other Congresses have been unable to deal with.

So I would encourage the Members to support lobbying disclosure reform and oppose all amendments to the lobbying disclosure reform bill. These amendments all have one thing in common. They will derail this effort to reform this law, which everyone admits desperately needs reforming.

#### THE SHUTDOWN OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, if we ask the average American what got shut down 25 days ago, they will say that the Federal Government got shut down 25 days ago. Well, I am here to tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that the city in which the Congress does its business got shut down completely 25 days ago. The city got shut down with its own money.

Mr. Speaker, because of limitations on home rule, our entire budget has to come here, although 85 percent of that budget is raised in the District of Columbia from District taxpayers. The District got shut down with its own money, although the District of Columbia is second per capita in taxes paid to the Federal Treasury among the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Suppose you represented people who paid that much tax and got shut down because they got caught in the middle of a debate that had nothing to do with them? I think you would be pretty mad, and so am I.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking on day 18, as we move toward December 15, that whatever quarrels the Federal Government and the President get in among themselves, that you not shut down my city again. This is a city in the midst of an awesome financial crisis, and the most that the Congress of the United States has been able to think to do to it is to allow it to be shut down.

Our appropriation is caught up here, 85 percent of that money, of course, being our own. What the Federal Government contributes is not a grant but is only a payment in lieu of taxes, because we cannot build on land occupied by the Federal Government and because we cannot build very high because of limitations put on us by the Congress of the United States. So who in the world would shut down people

who are already in the midst of a financial crisis, except people who are unaccountable to the people in that city, the 600,000 people that I represent?

Of course we, like the Federal Government, had to pay our employees, because they were put on forced administrative leave; and, thus, we have to pay for all of that lost productivity. Mr. Speaker, because of the fiscal crisis, these employees had already given back 6 furlough days and had already given back 12 percent of their pay because the city is in crisis.

This city is not a Federal agency. We are demanding that we be treated like a city and not like a Federal agency—like a city that pays its own way.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking that if we get to Day Zero and another continuing resolution is necessary, that D.C. not be put in another short-term continuing resolution. Do you realize what it is like to have to calibrate on a 2- or 3-week basis so that you do not overobligate your own money?

My continuing resolution will say look, you can spend your own money; we are holding back part of the Federal payment. That is the least you can do if you want to insert onto our appropriation stuck up here on provisions you want to insert onto our appropriation that have been undemocratically put there by Members unaccountable to the voters of the District of Columbia. Free the D.C. appropriation.

The chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. DAVIS has cosponsored an independent D.C. continuing resolution with me. Congress has already done damage, incalculable damage in shutting the District down. All I am asking now is if you cannot get our appropriation out, and I would not bet on getting it out by December 15, that the Congress not do more to hurt the innocent bystanders.

Those are the people who pay the highest taxes, barring none, if you combine local taxes and Federal taxes in the United States. Those are the people who contribute more to the Federal Treasury than Members who represent any jurisdiction in the United States, except New Jersey. We are second in Federal taxes only to New Jersey. So if you are not from New Jersey, you have to get behind the people I represent, get way behind them.

Let us keep our city open. Can you imagine that the Federal Government was delivering mail, but we could not pick up the trash in the District of Columbia for a week because of a dispute between the President and the Congress? That is your business. Stay out of our business. Let us keep our city open. Do us no harm. Do not get caught in the middle.

Shut down the Federal agencies if you must. That is your money. Do not shut down D.C. We have already paid for our city.

# AMERICAN TROOPS IN BOSNIA A DANGEROUS PROPOSITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to come to the House floor today, being a leader in this Congress, to speak against placing United States ground troops in Bosnia. Having listened to the President's address last night, I feel compelled to speak to not only the Members listening back in their offices but to the American people as well.

On October 30, 1995, this House voted overwhelmingly in a bipartisan fashion on the Buyer-McHale resolution, and it was approved by a vote of 315 to 103. Ninety-three members of the Democratic caucus, almost half, supported the proposition that expressed a sense of this Congress that U.S. ground troops should not be a part of a peace agreement in the Balkans. This resolution passed because the President's plan is ill-conceived, poorly defined, and highly dangerous.

It is ill-conceived because, over 2 years ago, the President promised 25,000 U.S. troops to enforce a future peace agreement. The President made this commitment without knowing the mission or the conditions of a peace agreement.

Peacing 25,000 United States troops on the ground to implement an agreement and to make an enforced peace is ill-conceived because the United States forces have lost the protection of neutrality after having bombed the Bosnian Serbs and promising to arm and train the Bosnian Moslems. U.S. troops, having lost this protection of neutrality, will become targets and casualties on the ground.

The implementation plan has been poorly defined. What is the mission of the NATO force? We need very clear objectives. What are the criteria for success? What is the exit strategy? A date set for withdrawal in 1 year is no exit strategy. Will the rules of engagement allow the force to accomplish the mission? How do we prevent the "mission creep" that we learned in Somalia that may escalate United States involvement in the Balkans beyond the time period which the President has set, and how do we keep United States troops from conducting nation-building exercises?

This implementation plan is also highly dangerous in that the United States and NATO forces will enforce an agreement that is politically unsustainable in a region of the world that has a long history of all sides exercising vengeance and retribution on one another. This is a long-term ethnic and religious conflict that could take generations to cure.

That is why the President of France has indicated that NATO's involvement in the Balkans could be 20 years, 20 years. Now the President is saying, we

are only going in for 1 year, and we have this exit strategy. Twenty years. Think of this. It is generational.

Now, the President last night made a good speech, but I would submit a good speech does not make good foreign policy. Whether it is mass murder or ethnic cleansing, the rape and the pillage and the plunder, the destruction are all violent to America's values. But if our foreign policy followed our heart and emotion, then U.S. troops would become the world's policeman and we would find ourselves in over 67 hot spots throughout the world. I do not believe America wants U.S. troops to be the world's policeman.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, we tie U.S. troops and their commitments on foreign soil to vital national security interests. Mr. Speaker, that is a lesson we learned in Somalia, that when a nation, when one of our own, our finest sons or daughters take an oath to lay down their life for this country for liberties and economic freedoms that many people take for granted, we in this Congress must ensure, and that we believe in their solemn oath to make sure that their life is not given in vain, that it is tied to national security interests.

I am extremely disappointed to be standing here and have the President of the United States ignore the will of this Congress, for we have voted twice on this issue of Bosnia in saying no to sending troops. I resent the position that the President of the United States has placed the American people in, I resent the position in which he has placed these American troops, and I resent the position that he has placed this U.S. Congress in. I remain highly skeptical of this deployment, and I recognize that the President, as Commander in Chief, can send these troops.

The Framers of the Constitution created friction between the legislative body and the President. Do we have to have the friction? We are going to. We are going to, because the President has on the blinders. He has ignored the will of the American people and this Congress, and he is sending the troops.

We control the purse strings. So what are we going to do? Well, I do not agree with the President's foreign policy with regard to placing ground troops in Bosnia. I believe that we have a key and vital role to play in the peace process and that we should be providing our air power and sea power and logistics on the ground in Bosnia but not sending the troops; and we have a duty to support our troops, but will narrow the parameters, define the criteria to minimize the loss of life.

## REJECT ISTOOK AND MCINTOSH ON LOBBYING REFORM LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Florida mentioned a few minutes ago, we will be resuming debate later today on the lobbying reform legislation. And, as he put it so well, I hope this House will reject all of the many amendments that are pending on this bill. Some have merit, but as the gentleman indicated, they will doom this bill. We do not need to risk that, and we should not.

As we resume consideration later today, it is especially important, I think, to understand what the amendments to be offered by my colleagues from Indiana and Oklahoma would do. I think once those amendments noticed by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] are understood, they will be rejected. However, we need to read them as they were once proposed, as a single legislative proposal. We can now not unscramble that egg.

Let me refer my colleagues to a statement made by that noted conservative columnist George Will about this proposal. He said, "It would make lawyers happy; it would erect a litigation-breeding regulatory regime of baroque complexity regarding political expression."

Now, why in the world would George Will say that about a proposal like this? Let me just give you a few examples of the terribly burdensome effect, the red-tape-breeding provisions of this legislation as it would affect what private organizations in America can do with their private money.

For example, the University of Georgia would be limited in how much contact it could have with Georgia's State government. That is because State colleges and universities that receive Federal grants would be regulated under this proposal and could only spend a limited amount on any kind of contacts with other governmental entities. The definition of governmental contact is very broad and includes State and local governments.

□ 1300

Another example. If the National Association of Counties has any contact with a Federal official about legislative or policy matters, then no county that is a member of NACO could receive Federal funds. Why is that? Well, under the McIntosh language, if a 501(c)(4) nonprofit like NACO engages in any lobbying, then it and all organizations that are affiliated with it are prohibited from receiving any kind of Federal grants, loans, or contracts.

Another example. A zealous, vigilante-type person could bring harassing lawsuits against State and local governments under this provision, as well as against universities, nonprofits, you name it. A cut of treble damage verdicts would be available to anybody that might wish to pursue such a lawsuit for violation of the McIntosh-Istook provisions under the False Claims Act. That is what would be put into the law by the McIntosh private citizen enforcement amendment.